

REMARKS

The Examiner rejected Claims 13, 21, 32 and 34 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e) as being anticipated by Smith. The Examiner rejected Claims 13, 17, 21 and 32-36 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Valent. To anticipate a claim, all of the recited limitations must be found either expressly or inherently in the four corners of the reference. The claims all recite a dedicated track that stores one or more system parameters. Neither Valent or Smith disclose storing system parameters.

Claim terms should be given their ordinary meaning to those of ordinary skill in the art. MPEP § 2111.01. Dictionary definitions may be used to determine the ordinary meaning of the term. Id. Such definitions should be examined in light of the intrinsic evidence, which includes the specification of the patent application.

Applicant is attaching hereto a dictionary definition of the term *parameter*. The first definition includes "an arbitrary constant or independent variable". The second definition defines *parameter* as "a set of physical properties whose values determine the characteristics or behavior of something". Taken together, the Applicant submits that these definitions, consistent with the intrinsic evidence, define a parameter as "a variable that defines the characteristic or behavior of the disk drive system". This construction is supported by the patent specification which lists position offset and read/write channel parameters. Position offset is information that varies between heads and defines a characteristic of each head in a drive. Additionally read/write channel parameters vary between drives and describe a characteristic of the read/write channel. These examples are

consistent with an interpretation of system parameter as a variable that determines the characteristics for behavior of a disk drive system.

Both Smith and Valent merely disclose servo bursts. Servo bursts are not system parameters as that term is ordinarily understood to one skilled in the art. Servo bursts are fixed values used to position a head. The bursts do not define a characteristic of behavior of the disk drive like a head position offset value or read/write channel parameters. The Applicant therefore submits that neither Smith or Valent anticipate the claims because neither reference discloses system parameters as that term would be ordinarily understood to one skilled in the art.

The Applicant also submits that these references would not render obvious the recited claims. The claims recite storing system parameters with the center of a dedicated track. Storing system parameters in the track centerline allows for reading of the parameters upon a boot-up of the drive. Additionally, the cited reference do not address the same problem solved by the recited claims. The cited claims address the issue of reading system parameters that can be used for subsequent operation of the drive. Neither Smith or Valent discuss reading data upon an initial boot-up of the drive. Because these references do not address this issue, one skilled in the art would not look to these references for a solution. Consequently these references do not teach or suggest the cited claims.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the claims are in condition for allowance.
Reconsideration of the rejections is requested. Allowance of Claims 1-12, 13, 17, 21, 32-
36 at an early date is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
IRELL & MANELLA LLP

Dated: March 16, 2005

840 Newport Center Drive, Suite 400
Newport Beach, CA 92660
949-760-0991

Ben York
BEN J. YORKS
Reg. No. 33,609

Certificate of Mailing

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited
with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an
envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box MS AF
1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on March 16, 2005.

Susan Langworthy 3/16/05
Susan Langworthy Date